

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Claims 1-42 remain pending. Of these, claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 9, 10, 16, 18, 20, 32, 34 and 36 are independent.

§ 103 REJECTION – PARULSKI, NORO

Claims 1-8, 10-15, 20-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32, 40 and 41 stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parulski (US Patent 6,836,617) in view of Noro et al. (US Patent 6,646,677). *See Final Office Action item 4.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

The communication apparatus as recited in claim 1 includes a first communication device, a displaying device, a selecting device, and a second communication device. The first communication device receives images from a recording device and also receives from the recording device identification information of the recording device. The displaying device displays the images received from the recording device and also displays a service menu of services enabled for a registered user of services identified by the identification. In other words, the various services are only available to registered users of the system.

MKM/HNS/jmb

Both Parulski and Noro fail to teach or suggest this feature. In addition, it is noted that Noro does not teach recording images as recited. For at least the above stated reasons, independent claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro.

Independent claim 3 recites, in part “a recording device that records the identification information and a service menu associated with the identification information and enabled for the registered user identified by the identification information” and “wherein the communication device transmits the service menu to the registered user.” In other words, the services are only available to the registered users. As amply demonstrated above, Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest this feature. For at least this reason, independent claim 3 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro.

Independent claim 5 recites, in part “a communication device that receives identification information of a camera used by a registered user identified by the identification information” and “a recording device that records user setting information on the registered user.” Again, the services are only available to the registered users, a feature which Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest. For at least this reason, independent claim 5 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro.

MKM/HNS/jmb

Independent claim 8 recites, in part “a recording device that records utility data showing services enabled for the registered user and being associated with the identification information”, “a determining device that determines an order of services in a service menu to be offered to the registered user in accordance with the utility data” and “wherein the communication device transmits the service menu showing the services in the order determined by the determining device.” It is clear that Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest these features. For at least this reason, independent claim 8 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro.

Independent claim 10 recites, in part “a device that reads from the recording device the user information associated with the identification information received by the communication device to specify the registered user, and provides a service corresponding to the service information to the registered user.” It is demonstrated above that Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest this feature. For at least this reason, independent claim 10 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro.

Independent claim 20 recites, in part “receiving images from a camera used by a registered user identified by identification information connected with a communication apparatus and the identification information of the camera from the camera” and “displaying the images and a service menu

MKM/HNS/jmb

associated with the identification information and enabled for the registered user identified by the identification information on a displaying device of the communication apparatus.” Again, Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest the features where the services are only available to the registered users. For at least this reason, independent claim 20 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro.

Independent claim 32 recites, in part “reading from the recording device the user information associated with the received identification information to specify the registered user, and providing the service to the registered user.” It is amply demonstrated above that Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest this feature. For at least this reason, independent claim 32 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro.

Claims 2, 4, 6-7, 11-15, 21-22, 24-26, 28-29, 32, 40 and 41 depend from independent claims 1, 3, 5, 10, 20 and 32 directly or indirectly. Thus, for at least due to the dependency thereon, these dependent claims are also distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro.

For at least the above stated reasons, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-8, 10-15, 20-22, 24-26, 28-30, 32, 40 and 41 based on Parulski and Noro be withdrawn.

MKM/HNS/jmb

§ 103 REJECTION – PARULSKI, NORO, JEBENS

Claims 9, 23, 27, 31, 38 and 39 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parulski and Noro and in further view of Jebens et al. (US Patent 6,332,146). *See Final Office Action item 5.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 9 recites, in part “a device that allows services to the registered user when the passwords are the same and prohibits the services to the registered user when the passwords are different.” It is amply shown above that Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest this feature. Jebens is not relied upon to correct for at least this deficiency of Parulski and Noro. For at least this reason, independent claim 9 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Jebens.

Claims 23, 27 and 31 depend from independent claim 20 directly or indirectly and it is shown above that claim 20 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro. Jebens is not relied upon to correct for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Parulski and Noro. Thus, claim 20 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Jebens. Then for at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 23, 27 and 31 are also distinguishable over the same combination.

MKM/HNS/jmb

Claims 38 and 39 depend from independent claim 1 directly or indirectly and it is shown above that claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro. Jebens is not relied upon to correct for at least the above-noted deficiencies of Parulski and Noro. Thus, claim 1 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Jebens. Then for at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 38 and 39 are also distinguishable over the same combination.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 9, 23, 27, 31, 38 and 39 based on Parulski, Noro and Jebens be withdrawn.

§ 103 REJECTION – PARULSKI, NORO, SLOANE

Claims 16-19, 33-37 and 42 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Parulski and Noro and in further view of Sloane (US Patent 5,918,211). *See Final Office Action item 6.* Applicant respectfully traverses.

Independent claim 16 recites, in part “wherein the communication device transmits the read after-sales service information to the registered user.” It is amply demonstrated above that Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest this feature. Sloane is not relied upon to correct for at least this deficiency of

MKM/HNS/jmb

Parulski and Noro. For at least this reason, independent claim 16 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Sloane.

Independent claim 18 recites “wherein the communication device transmits the read after-sales service information to the registered user.” It is amply demonstrated above that Parulski and Noro cannot teach or suggest this feature. Sloane is not relied upon to correct for at least this deficiency of Parulski and Noro. For at least this reason, independent claim 18 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Sloane.

Independent claim 34 recites “receiving the identification information from the registered user” and “transmitting the after-sales service information to the registered user.” It is clear that independent claim 34 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Sloane.

Independent claim 36 recites “receiving the identification information and at least one of the status information and the history information from the registered user” and “transmitting the read after-sales service information to the registered user.” It is clear that independent claim 36 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Sloane.

Claims 17, 19, 35 and 37 depend from independent claims 16, 18, 34 or 36. Therefore, for at least due to the dependency thereon, claims 17, 19, 35

MKM/HNS/jmb

and 37 are also distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Sloane.

Claim 33 depends from independent claim 32 and it is demonstrated above the claim 32 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro. Sloane is not relied upon to correct for at least the above noted deficiencies of Parulski and Noro. Therefore, claim 32 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Sloane. For at least due to the dependency thereon, claim 33 is also distinguishable over the same combination.

Claim 42 depends from independent claim 8 and it is demonstrated above the claim 8 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski and Noro. Sloane is not relied upon to correct for at least the above noted deficiencies of Parulski and Noro. Therefore, claim 8 is distinguishable over the combination of Parulski, Noro and Sloane. For at least due to the dependency thereon, claim 42 is also distinguishable over the same combination.

Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 16-19, 33-37 and 42 based on Parulski, Noro and Sloane be withdrawn.

MKM/HNS/jmb

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance.

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Hyung Sohn (Reg. No. 44,346), to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Date: June 8, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH &, BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Michael K. Mutter

Reg. No. 29,680

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicant

MKM/HNS/jmb
0879-0345P

MKM/HNS/jmb